[redacted]

ED 019 347 [redacted] 58

[redacted] INSTITUTE ON PROBLEMS OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION. JUNE 20, 1966-AUGUST 26, 1967. NORTH CAROLINA UNIV., CHAPEL HILL LEARNING INST. OF NORTH CAROLINA, ROUSEMONT OFFICE OF EDUCATION (DHEW), WASHINGTON, D.C.

[redacted] PUB DATE 67

[redacted] MF-$0.25 HC-$1.00 [redacted]P.

DESCRIPTORS- [redacted] INSTITUTES (TRAINING PROGRAMS), [redacted] TEACHER EDUCATION, [redacted] INTEGRATION, [redacted] ATTITUDES, [redacted] SUMMER INSTITUTES, COUNSELORS, [redacted] SCHOOLS, [redacted] RECREATION PROGRAMS, TUTORING, [redacted] ACTIVITIES, TEACHERS, [redacted] ATTITUDES, QUESTIONNAIRES, ATTITUDE TESTS, WINSTON SALEM, NORTH CAROLINA

THE ACTIVITIES OF AN 8-WEEK SUMMER TRAINING INSTITUTE ON PROBLEMS OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION ARE DESCRIBED IN THIS REPORT. THE 54 PARTICIPANTS WERE RACIALLY INTEGRATED AND CONSISTED OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS, COUNSELORS, AND ADMINISTRATORS. THE GENERAL GOAL OF THE INSTITUTE WAS TO INCREASE PARTICIPANTS' KNOWLEDGE OF UNDERACHIEVEMENT, THEIR UNDERSTANDING OF HUMAN AND RACE RELATIONS, AND THEIR SKILLS IN TEACHING IN DESEGREGATED CLASSROOMS. PARTICIPANTS RECEIVED GROUP TRAINING FROM EIGHT HUMAN RELATIONS SPECIALISTS AND WERE ENROLLED IN A GRADUATE LEVEL COURSE IN "PSYCHOEDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION." IN ADDITION, AS PART OF AN INSTITUTE PRACTICUM, THE PARTICIPANTS TUTORED AN INTEGRATED GROUP OF STUDENTS AND ENGAGED WITH THEM IN RECREATIONAL-SOCIAL ACTIVITIES. RESEARCH PERSONNEL ADMINISTERED VARIOUS ATTITUDE SCALES AND QUESTIONNAIRES TO PARTICIPANTS BOTH BEFORE AND AFTER THEIR TRAINING, AND DATA WERE GATHERED FROM THE OBSERVATIONS OF STAFF MEMBERS. THESE DATA HAVE NOT YET BEEN ANALYZED. HOWEVER, SUBJECTIVE DATA COLLECTED FROM PARTICIPANTS INDICATE THAT THEIR ATTITUDES CHANGED AND THAT THE ENTIRE PROGRAM WAS "HIGHLY SUCCESSFUL," EXCEPT THE PRACTICUM WHICH WAS RATED AS ONLY "MODERATELY SUCCESSFUL." (LB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

05258

ED019347

SPECIAL TRAINING INSTITUTE ON PROBLEMS OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

June 20, 1966 - August 31, 1967

sponsored by the

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

CHAPEL HILL, NORTH CAROLINA

in association with the

LEARNING INSTITUTE OF NORTH CAROLINA

and in cooperation with the

UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION

EQUAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM

Dwight C. Rhyne
Project Director

UD 005 238

The Special Training Institute on Problems of School Desegregation held in Winston-Salem, N. C., June 20 - August 12, 1966, focused on three major areas: (1) knowledge and understanding of various sub-cultures and related variables that affect learning; (2) skills in dealing with classroom and school problems in human relations; and (3) principles of learning that relate to the ratio of ability to achievement. The Institute was attended by 54 participants, 7th, 8th, and 9th grade teachers, counselors, and administrators representative of the three racial groups in the state.

The program was designed on the assumption that the teacher, counselor, administrator team could play a key role in dealing with problems occasioned by school desegregation. Presently, however, this team is composed of personnel who have been trained in middle-class schools. Middle class values influence their perception of learning and the learning process. Research on attitudes of teachers toward disadvantaged children generally shows more negative evaluations of these children than of middle class children.[1] They need to develop sets conducive to achieving a broader understanding of the dynamics of the current social revolution, and to develop skills in making their academic subjects relevant to the interests and needs of the culturally deprived.

---

[1]Bloom, Benjamin S., Allison Davis, and Robert Hess, Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation. New York, Holt Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965. p. 75.

Knowledge of under-achievement and related factors, understanding of human and race relations, and skills in teaching in desegregated classes were areas of concern to the Institute. But a number of closely related areas seemed equally important. A concomitant of under achievement is lack of motivation. Children who have a history of underachievement lose confidence in their ability, lower their aspirations, and lose interest in performing well.[2] Students in segregated minority schools are particularly susceptible to this development. Their limited experiences and their perception of minority group adulthood often lead them to the conclusion that education is a meaningless activity. Alienation from the mainstream of society has already started.

In view of these problems, the Institute emphasized the confrontation of attitudes which might hinder teachers in guiding students of diverse backgrounds to achieve in accordance with their abilities. Active participation with other teachers and with students in a productive atmosphere of racial equality was a corallary effort. The development of self-confidence in dealing with problems of school desegregation requires experience in integration.

Specific Institute objectives were as follows:

(1) To acquire greater knowledge of the sociological background of various cultural and ethnic groups and of race relations.

---

[2]Bristow, William H., Low Achievement: A Memorandum and a Bibliography. Board of Education of the City of New York.

(2) To learn more of the principles concerning the relationship of the student's background to motivation and achievement.

(3) To acquire greater understanding of various ethnic groups and of human relations.

(4) To develop greater skill in dealing with administrative, classroom and/or counseling problems related to school desegregation.

(5) To improve skills in teaching language arts, social studies, science and mathematics.

The setting for the Institute was the North Carolina Advancement School in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, a relatively new institution supported by funds from the State Board of Education, U. S. Office of Education, and the Carnegie Corporation. The Advancement School provided the Institute with an integrated, residential, experimental laboratory for underachieving eighth grade students and their teachers. The School's purpose is to attack the twin problems of underachievement and motivation through the development of appropriate curriculum and methodology and concomitant in-service training for teachers in both their subject areas and in the social and behavioral sciences. It began its program in November, 1964, when a six-week pilot program was initiated for 80 students and 10 visiting teachers. In January 1965, a regular session, lasting a full 11 weeks, began for 160 students and 17 visiting teachers and counselors. Four additional eleven-week sessions serving the School's maximum enrollment of 320 students and 30-35 visiting teachers have

been held. In order that the Institute would have a maximum effect, the School cut back its student enrollment to 160 during the eight-week summer session in order to accommodate the 54 public school teachers, counselors, and administrators participating in the Institute. This same procedure was followed for the first Institute on Problems of School Desegregation held during the summer of 1965.

There is a resident staff of 30 professional personnel at the School including research staff, teachers, counselors, technical specialists, a librarian and the director. They cooperated with the Institute staff. This Advancement School staff is diverse in background and experience and is biracial in nature.

Advancement School students represent a real cross section of the State in socio-economic status and ethnic group composition. One characteristic, however, is common to them all: they are selected because they have been underachievers in school in that they are judged by intelligence scores and other means to have average or above average potential but are achieving at one or more years below grade level in such basic areas as reading and mathematics. Within this criterion, students nevertheless possess a wide range of abilities.

For institute participants, cognitive learning experiences in the social and behavioral sciences included lectures and discussions related to prejudice and discrimination and their effects on motivation and achievement. The academic coordinator and visiting lecturers reviewed research on attitudes of students toward education and toward teachers of differing race or class.

Attention was devoted to values, beliefs and opinions of various subgroups in our culture. Lectures and readings emphasized the implications of these elements for learning and adjustment in integrated classroom situations.

A less tangible, but important aspect of the program is that the participants were living in an integrated situation and thus had the opportunity to learn first-hand, through both their living arrangements and the laboratory of the Advancement School, that integration can work and that children, even underachievers, from different backgrounds are educable and can benefit from instruction in a pluralistic setting.

Components of the eight-week Institute include (1) A three-semester hour graduate level course, Education 267w--Psycho-Educational Problems of School Desegregation; (2) Human Relations Training; (3) Institute Practicum; (4) Social Activities; and (5) Research and Evaluation.

1. Education 267w, Psycho-Educational Problems of School Desegregation, was developed especially for the Institute. Dr. Kinnard White, Assistant Professor of Education at the University of North Carolina, was in charge of the course. He organized the course around the following topics and readings.

A. Introduction: Integration in Education: A General Overview

Readings: "Stell vs. Savannah - Chatham Board of Education," in H. Humphrey, Integration vs. Segregation, pp. 235-240.

"Brown vs. Board of Education," in H. Humphrey, Integregation vs. Segregation, pp. 23-31.

A. Davis, "The Education of Culturally Deprived Children," Reprint from YES.

Wm. C. Kvaraceus, "Negro Youth and Social Adaptation: The Role of the School as an Agent of Change," @ in Wm. C. Kvaraceus (ed.), Negro Self Concept, pp. 91-169.

D. Hagar, "Social and Psychological Factors in Integration," Journal of Educational Sociology, 31:57-63, 1957.

M. Grossack, "Psychological Considerations Essential to Effective Educational Integration," Journal of Negro Education, 34:278-287, 1965.

B. Some Descriptive Characteristics of Segregated Children

Readings: F. Riessman, The Culturally Deprived Child, Ch. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6.

F. Riessman, "The Culturally Deprived Child: A New View," Reprint from YES.

M. Tumin, "Race and Intelligence," in H. Humphrey, Integration vs. Segregation, pp. 257-271.

F. McGurk, "A Scientist's Report on Race Differences," in H. Humphrey, Integration vs. Segregation, pp. 243-256.

R. Cloward and J. Jones, "Social Class, Educational Attitudes and Participation," in A. Harry Passow, Education in Depressed Areas, pp. 190-216.

K. Clark, "The Clash of Cultures in the Classroom". Reprint from YES.

C. Some Effects of Segregation Upon Children

Readings: F. Riessman, The Culturally Deprived Child, ch. 7, 8.

C. Silverman, "The Negro and the School," Reprint from YES.

M. Dentsch, "The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process," in A. Harry Passow, Education in Depressed Areas, pp. 163-179.

F. Riessman, "Tutoring the Disadvantaged Child," Reprint from YES.

R. Coles, "The Desegregation of Southern Schools: A Psychiatric Study," in H. Humphrey, Integration vs. Segregation, pp. 201-229.

J. Grambs, "The Self-Concept: Basis for Re-education of Negro Youth," in Wm. C. Kvaraceus (ed.) Negro Self-Concept, pp. 11-51.

D. Ausubel and P. Ausubel, "Ego Development Among Segregated Negro Children," in A. Harry Passow, Education in Depressed Areas, pp. 109-141.

J. Baldwin, "The Negro Child: His Self Image," Reprint from YES.

D. Problems in Achieving the Integrated School

Readings: T. Pettigrew, "Continuing Barriers to Desegregation in the South," Sociology of Education, 38:99-111, 1965.

J. Fisher, "Educational Problems of Segregation and Desegregation," in A. Harry Passow, Education in Depressed Areas, pp. 290-297.

I. Berlin, "Desegregation Creates Problems Too," in H. Humphrey, Integration vs. Segregation, pp. 230-234.

K. Clark, "Educational Stimulation of Racially Disadvantaged Children," in A. Harry Passow, Education in Depressed Areas, pp. 142-162.

F. Riessman, The Culturally Deprived Child, ch. 9, 10, 12.

D. Gottlieb, "Teaching and Students: The Views of Negro and White Teachers," Sociology of Education, 37: 345-353, 1964.

C. Hansen, "The Scholastic Performance of Negro and White Pupils in the Integrated Public Schools of the District of Columbia," Harvard Educational Review, 30:216-236, 1960.

M. Grossack, "Psychological Considerations Essential to Effective Educational Integration," Journal of Negro Education, 34:278-287, 1965.

R. Dwyer, "A Report on Patterns of Interaction in Desegregated Schools," Journal of Educational Sociology, 31:253-256, 1958.

D. Trueblood, "The Role of the Counselor in the Guidance of Negro Students," Harvard Educational Review, 30:252-269, 1960.

M. Elliott and A. Badol, "Achievement and Racial Composition of Schools," California Journal of Educational Research, 16:158-166, 1965.

R. Green and W. Farquhar, "Negro Academic Motivation and Scholastic Achievement," Journal of Educational Psychology, 56:241-243, 1965.

Mrs. Muriel B. Walker served as librarian for the Institute. Her report indicated that 1292 books, periodicals, reprints, and pamphlets were circulated during the Institute.

2. Human Relations Training

Dr. Donald Moore directed this component of the Institute. He was ably assisted by five human relations specialists, the acting associate director, and the administrative assistant.

It was the purpose of the human relations program to direct itself toward objective number two: i.e., to acquire greater understanding of various ethnic groups and of human relations.

The fifty-four (54) participants were assigned to eight sub-groups of not more than seven members each which met for one hour four days each week throughout the Institute. Eight human relations specialists served as the counselors for these subgroups. The counselors used questions submitted anonymously

by the participants to structure the early sessions. The participants had been asked to submit questions which they preferred to discuss in their subgroups.

The subgroups started with discussions of their own questions re: the problems of school desegregation. The human relations specialists structured the initial sessions in order to keep the discussions meaningful and relevant. Group dynamics soon became operative and a number of techniques were utilized in order to permit the groups to deal with key issues in human relations and to direct them toward prevalent problems of school desegregation. These techniques included: (1) role-playing; (2) alter ego; (3) group counseling "going-around"; and (4) in some instances, a "hot seat" group counseling technique.

Coordination of the group counseling was partly achieved by having the entire Institute meet one day each week to consider some general principles of good human relations. In the first two of these sessions, tape recordings were employed to illustrate basic adjustments necessary for and fundamental to all human relations. Subsequent sessions included fundamental aspects of individual personality adjustment as they apply to human relations. Another feature of the coordination of the human relations program was the report of the recorders from each of the subgroups.

Coordination of the human relations aspect was achieved as follows:

1. Via the Institute meeting together for tapes, lectures, and discussions on the principles of good human relations.
2. Reports (oral and written) from the recorders for the groups as to what was happening within the subgroups.
3. Weekly planning meetings of the human relations specialists.
4. Individual meetings of the coordinator with the human relations specialists (as needed).

Representatives from the groups were elected to work with the acting director of the Advancement School and members of his staff in evaluative and advisory capacities. According to statements by the acting director, these were helpful functions of the group representatives.

The group recorders served as an advisory group to evaluate the Institute via written weekly reports and a final written report submitted on the last day of the Institute.

On the last day, each individual was asked to rate the group counseling sessions and to make critical suggestions about improving them. Almost invariably, the group sessions received a high rating and there were numerous comments that they be continued in subsequent institutes. It seems that the group counseling sessions met a real need for some of these participants.

3. Institute Practicum

Mr. John Buchanan, of the North Carolina Advancement School, was in charge of institute practicum.

Each Wednesday from 1:00 p.m. until 9:30 p.m. and two hours on Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday (usually 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.) the 54 participants were responsible for the 130 Advancement

School students. The programs planned for the 1:00 to 3:00 period were usually academic, whereas the Wednesday program was recreational.

The participants were asked to tutor the Advancement School students in their academic work for two hours on Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday. Students had about an hour for preparation each night for their academic classes the following day. These tutoring sessions gave the participants the opportunity to meet the Advancement School students, become acquainted with some of the Advancement School materials, to talk with students attending an integrated school, and, for those participants who had no previous opportunity, to tutor, counsel or socialize with students of another race. Each participant was assigned two or three students in the house group with whom he worked; these students were then the participant's special charge. The participants in some cases were invited to the planning sessions held each week by house groups and were integral members of the house group.

Questions submitted by the Institute participants during the first week of the Institute seemed to suggest interest (and

some fears) about social activities in newly integrated schools.[1]

---

[1] What effect does integration have on extracurricular activities:

Will desegregation of the schools bring about dating between whites and Negroes and lead to marriage?

How does one handle extracurricular activities such as dances when mixed couples dance and there are white parents present who rebel entirely against this and create a scene? Should school functions such as dances, banquets, etc. be cut out of school activities to prevent this? If so, are not the students deprived of their enjoyments?

Do the group members fear that social assimilation will result from school integration?

If the races are brought together socially, does it not lead to intermarriage?

What is the feeling here about intermarriage? Is it discussed strictly on what is sociologically best for the individual?

Will integration bring about a high increase of intermarriage?

How do you cope with social problems?

In what ways can Negro students be more active in extracurricular activities?

I would like to hear opinions on mixed dating.

I'm vitally interested in the social aspect of integration. How the Negro feels about the social aspect. Why we whites consider the social aspect the critical, dynamic one.

Does the Negro feel also that the economic and educational aspects may be more easily solved? I would like to discuss the danger involved in interpersonal relationships in socializing apart from economic and educational aspects.

What about "out of school" social situations, such as club dances? Should the Negro student be invited or should he attend of his own initiative?

The Wednesday afternoon and evening program was planned so that the participants would have a variety of social experiences with the students. The program was primarily a recreational program and involved leaving the Advancement School each Wednesday and traveling to one of several public facilities. Three state parks (Hanging Rock, Morrow Mountain, Kerr-Scott Dam) were used, plus two city parks in Winston-Salem. The groups consisted of sixty-five students and about thirty participants--a total of about one hundred people. These parks provided opportunities for swimming, boating, hiking, fishing and various team sports. One of the parks is a predominately Negro facility, whereas the other four are predominately white facilities. The participants had an opportunity to observe not only the boys but also these people who were at the parks on Wednesday afternoons. They had the opportunity to plan and discipline the boys, to travel as an

---

[1](Continued from previous page)

How much planned social activities should there be between racial groups, and should there be any interference with the individual in his choice of associates even though they tend to be along racial lines?

The Klan and other similar organizations say that the main purpose of integration as far as Negroes are concerned is for the purpose of intermarriage. I have never heard a Negro leader say this. What do you think of this?

Discuss social and/or economic pressures involved in integration resistance.

Can any race or minority group find genuine acceptance by the majority without assimilation to the point of having an accepting attitude toward intermarriage?

integrated group to and from the parks. On one occasion, five girls--four white and one Negro--approximately the same age as the boys, were invited to accompany the boys on their weekly outing.

The practicum contained as many different experiences and contacts as could be conveniently arranged so that the participants might have opportunities to know first hand what (if any) problems they might face in dealing with the social aspect of desegregation in their schools.

4. Social Activities

Social activities in the Institute on Problems of School Desegregation were organized by Mrs. Doretha Black. On the first night, June 20, 1966, a planned social hour consisted of entertainment by a high school music teacher and several students, group singing and chattering, and refreshments. Although this gathering had a formal overtone, it was an initiatory step toward more relaxed social living.

"Institute Sing-Out of 1966" was an enlightening experience for participants. The group gathered in the lobby of the dormitory July 11 at 1:30 p.m., sang familiar songs including Negro spirituals. The general atmosphere was relaxed and comfortable; a deep feeling of sincere regard and respect for music was communicated by the experience.

A professional square dance caller, Mr. Philip Bostian, directed the folk dancing on Monday, July 18, 1966 at 7:30 p.m.

He was able to stimulate group participation by his enthusiasm and his vast knowledge and training in teaching groups to dance. The music was appropriate and excited more than 90% of the group to participate.

Various interracial groups of participants ate together on several occasions in public restaurants in the community. Many white participants had their first experiences in Negro homes, and many Negro participants visited in the homes of whites for the first time. Playing golf, going to movies, bowling, and swimming became favorite free time pastimes of Institute participants.

Informal receptions followed the presentations of each consultant. A buffet luncheon was held when Dr. Robert Green visited the Institute. A similar buffet was held on Friday, August 12. This was the last activity for the group before leaving for home.

"Discussion Under The Tree" became an everyday social gathering for Institute participants. Perhaps the greatest results in inter-personal relations took place in these unplanned discussions. "The Tree," located outside the dormitory where participants lived, was felt to acquire an Institute "soul" by the many groups that met there just for a chat while relaxing or waiting for an event to take place.

The Advancement School staff and students were often included in sports activities, movie going and eating out. Perhaps one of the most significant social highlights was the final banquet,

which was held on Thursday, August 11, 1966 at 5:30 p.m. At this time, Advancement School staff and students, and Institute staff and participants ate "family style" in House Groups, heard various ceremonies, and witnessed the award presentations for the students. This event was an appropriate gesture to the boys before their graduation on Friday, August 12, at 9:00 a.m.

5. Research and Evaluation.

Dr. Kinnard White was responsible for research done in conjunction with the Institute on School Desegregation . The research was composed of two components. One component was characterized by the collection of paper and pencil responses from the participants relative to the affective domain of behavior. The second component was characterized by the collection of information resulting from the observations of the staff members. These latter observations consisted of both verbalized and motor behavior.

The instruments used in the first research component were:

1. The Study of Values (aesthetic, social, political, economic, theoretical, religious)

2. The Gough Adjective Check List

3. Four Attitude Scales

    a. attitudes toward associations
    b. attitudes concerning characteristics of groups
    c. Sympathetic Identification with the underdog
    d. Prejudice and the Norm of Rationality

4. Six semantic differential scales

    a. integrated school
    b. segregated school
    c. Negro teacher
    d. white teacher
    e. Negro student
    f. white student

5. A general questionnaire to obtain basic information such as race, sex, position, etc.

The above scales were administered in a pre and post test fashion to each of the participants. In addition, a control group was utilized consisting of teachers, principals, and counselors of similar backgrounds who were enrolled in summer school study at North Carolina College at Durham, A & T College at Greensboro, U. N. C. at Charlotte, and U. N. C. at Chapel Hill. A pre and post test was administered to two groups from the college summer school sample at approximately the same dates as the administrations in the Institute.

Summary

A typical day for an Institute participant included the following:

6:45 - 7:30 a.m.----------Breakfast
7:30 - 8:30 a.m.----------Lecture, Education 267w
8:30 - 9:00 a.m.----------Coffee Break
9:00 -10:00 a.m.----------Counseling Session
10:00 -11:30 a.m.----------Library (Free Reading), meetings, etc.
11:30 -12:45 p.m.----------Lunch
1:00 - 3:00 p.m.----------Practicum (Work with students)
3:00 - 5:15 p.m.----------Study
5:15 - 6:15 p.m.----------Supper
7:30 - 9:00 p.m.----------Consultants, Socials, Entertainment, etc.

1:00 - 9:30 p.m.----------Wednesdays--Practicum

The following data indicate the racial, sex, and age breakdown of the staff members and participants in the Institute:

Staff Members	11 (7 whites, 4 Negroes)
Participants	54 (Representing 32 counties, 29 whites, 23 Negroes, 2 Indians)

24 Female 30 Male

Age Grouping

	20-29	30-39	40-49	50+
Negroes - female	4	4	5	
male	4	2	2	2
Whites - female	5		1	
male	7	3	5	4
				4
Indians - female				
male		1		1
	20	10	13	11

Negroes	Whites	Indians
13 female	10 female	2 male
10 male	19 male	
23	29	

In February, Institute participants and the key administrative officials were invited to a two-day conference in Chapel Hill. Staff members of the summer Institute and North Carolina Advancement School and consultants were invited to participate. The follow-up conference was designed to give maximum time to the discussion of the salient problems of desegregation in the local school systems.

Staff members of the Institute included:

Mr. Dwight Rhyne, Project Director

Mr. John Buchanan, Acting Associate Director

Mrs. Doretha Black, Administrative Assistant

Mrs. Muriel Walker, Librarian

Dr. Kinnard P. White, Academic Coordinator

Dr. Donald Moore, Human Relations Coordinator

Miss Inez Richardson, Human Relations Coordinator

Mr. Bob Jones, Human Relations Specialist

Mrs. Suzanne E. Hawley, Human Relations Specialist

Mr. Preston Raymond Allison, Human Relations Specialist

Mr. Carl L. Gaskey, Human Relations Specialist

The following consultants were instrumental in assisting the Institute to achieve its objectives:

Dr. Dan W. Dodson, Director, Human Relations Center, New York University, New York, New York

Dr. Robert Green, Professor of Education, Michigan State University, Lansing, Michigan

Mr. Frank Stanley, Jr. Associate Director, National Urban League, New York, New York

Mrs. Louise Wilson, Acting Director, Experiment in Self-Reliance, Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Mr. Robert Severs, Coordinator, Federal Projects, Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools, Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Mr. James K. Polk, Director, Bureau on Employment, Training and Placement, Charlotte, North Carolina

Mr. William Flowers, North Carolina Fund, Durham, North Carolina

Miss Jane Dull, Music Teacher, Parkland High School Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Mr. Philip Bostian, Recreation Director, Winston-Salem, North Carolina

The following persons expressed regret that they could not accept invitations to serve as consultants:

Dr. Harold Howe, U. S. Commissioner of Education

Dr. Robert C. Weaver, U. S. Secretary of Urban Affairs

Dr. Kenneth Clark, Director of the Department of Psychology, The City University of New York

Dr. Thomas F. Pettigrew, Professor of Psychology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Dr. Elias Blake, Professor of Education, Howard University, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Joseph Hymes, Professor of Sociology, North Carolina College, Durham, North Carolina

As the structure of the Institute indicates, a number of learning principles were considered in planning the program. The format included formal class lectures followed by questions and discussion; an excellent library; small group discussion on emotionally charged issues that grew out of the subject matter; special programs, role playing, films, and various other methods and techniques woven into the Institute; a practicum, informal activities, and an atmosphere conducive to discussion of topics related to our purposes; a continuing and extensive evaluation by the Institute staff, by the participants, and by the Advancement School staff.

The subject matter of the Institute was grounded in the current social revolution. Tension was inevitable every day and in every type of activity. By the end of the first week of the Institute, participants were beginning to speak rather freely of their values, beliefs, prejudices, discrimination experiences,

and feelings about current social trends. The discussion groups, the human relations specialists, and the other staff members assisted each other in determining when the level of tension became too high. Actually, it is not correct to speak of a level of tension because of the dynamic nature of the Institute. Within the various activites, and particularly, within the small groups, tension fluctuated greatly. There was no problem of arousal.

The questions submitted by the participants for discussion in the human relations sessions were used as well by other staff members as guides. As a result, all of the contributions seemed to be more meaningful to the participants than similar efforts in 1965. Questions became somewhat more frank as the weeks passed. (I'm glad the Institute ended after eight weeks!)

The examination papers written by the participants indicate that cognitive change occurred, although we had no pre-test to determine the extent of this facet of change. Subjective-type evaluation data show that participants considered the Institute highly successful in achieving four of its stated objectives and moderately successful in achieving the fifth. They felt that the problems of coordinating the Institute program with the Advancement School program and the lack of sufficient time were the principal factors that kept us from being "highly successful" in improving skills in teaching language arts, social studies, science and mathematics, the fifth objective.

In the opinion of the staff, changes in attitude and teaching behavior occurred. There can be no certainty or even probability of these latter changes, however, until the data collected have been analyzed.

REFERENCES

1. Bloom, Benjamin S., Allison Davis, and Robert Hess. Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.

2. Bristow, William H., Low Achievement: A Memorandum and a Bibliography. New York: Board of Education of the City of New York, 1959.

3. Davis, Allison, Social-Class Influences Upon Learning. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.

4. Messick, Samuel J., "The Perception of Social Attitudes," in Lester D. Crow and Alice Crow, editors, Readings in Human Learning. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1963.

5. Page, Ellis B., "Teacher Comments and Student Performance: A Seventy-Four Classroom Experiment in School Motivation," in Journal of Educational Psychology, 1958, Vol. 49, No. 4, pp. 173-181.

6. Sargent, S. Stansfeld and Robert C. Williamson. Social Psychology: An Introduction to the Study of Human Relations, Chaps. 5, 19, 21 and 22. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1958.

7. Tyler, Ralph W., "Conditions for Effective Learning," in Lester D. Crow and Alice Crow, editors, Readings in Human Learning. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1963.